DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 448 IR 007 922

AUTHOR Zeiss, Paul A.
TITLE Ascertaining Desirable Competencies of Broadcast Announcers. Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 43p.: Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Broadcast Industry: *Competence: Journalism: Media Research: *Professional Personnel: Qualifications: Questionnaires: *Radio: Surveys: *Television
IDENTIFIERS *Announcers

ABSTRACT

This research was undertaken in an effort to identify the desirable competencies of anncuncers as required by the broadcast industry. In order to identify the announcing competencies sought by the broadcast industry, a questionnaire was mailed to a representative number of Texas radio and television station operations managers. The random sample was stratified according to market size in order to detect any differences contributed by this population dimension. A percentage determination of the responses to each question when compared to types of stations indicated there were some similarities and differences in competencies desired by operations managers. A breakdown by market size on these inconclusive items explained some tendencies unique to each population density. Based on survey results, announcing training should include an emphasis on the competencies desired by both radio and television stations. A further analysis suggests that most radio stations desire announcers with disc jockey skills, while television stations would like journalistic skills, and both require basic voice and reading competencies. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180448

ASCERTAINING DESIRABLE COMPETENCIES OF BROADCAST ANNOUNCERS

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

Paul A. Zeiss, M.S.
Central Texas College

CLUSTER COORDINATOR

Dr. Anita Barrett
Dallas, Ft. Worth II

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Anthony Zeiss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

Jan. 1977

IR007922

Abstract

Colleges throughout the nation had long faced a continuing problem of maintaining updated, efficient training techniques in the technologies. Producing well-trained announcers current with industrial needs had been no exception.

This research was undertaken in an effort to identify the desirable competencies of announcers as required by the broadcast industry. A practicum proposal to this end was submitted to Nova University and approved.

In order to identify the announcing competencies sought by the broadcast industry, a questionnaire was mailed to a representative number of Texas radio and television station operations managers. The random sample was stratified according to market sizes in order to detect any differences contributed by this population dimension.

The sample return represented 13.8 percent of all Texas television stations and 5.1 percent of all Texas radio stations. Fifty-five percent of the television responses were from major markets and forty-five percent represented medium markets. Forty-eight percent of the radio responses were from major and medium markets and fifty-two percent represented small markets.

A percentage determination of the responses to each question when compared to types of stations indicated there were some similarities and differences in competencies desired by broadcast operations managers. Additionally, there were a few response items from both radio station and television station data that were controversial in value. A breakdown by market sizes on these inconclusive items explained some tendencies unique to each population density.

Based on survey results, announcing training should include an emphasis on the competencies desired by both radio and televison stations where in agreement and where unique to each medium. A breakdown of the collected data further suggested that most radio stations desired announcers with disc jockey skills. Most television stations desired announcers with journalistic skills. All types of broadcast stations desired basic voice and reading competencies for audio production purposes.

It was recommended that broadcast announcing training at Central Texas College recognize the implications of the research study by redesigning the announcing course to include the training of those competencies desired by the broadcast industry as reflected in the survey results.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	2
PROCEDURES	4
RESULTS	6
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	7
REFERENCES CITED	16
APPENDIXES	17
A. Central Texas College Telecommunications Advisory Committee Minutes	19
B. Central Texas College Survey	22
C. Pretest Information	25
D. Survey Instrument	31
E. Table I	33
F. Table II	36
G. Table III	38
PROPOSAL	

Introduction

Technological advances in the past four decades increased the need for skills training in all industries. As technology progressed, industrial needs and training emphases changed accordingly. Colleges throughout the nation faced the continuing problem of maintaining updated, efficient training techniques in the technologies. Producing well-trained announcers current with industrial needs was no exception.

There were indications that present industrial requirements for announcers had not been satisfied (Central Texas College Telecommunications Advisory Committee, 1976, Appendix A). There had been no standard among colleges for broadcast announcer training and it seemed probable that colleges with radio-television programs had not been preparing announcers with the competencies needed in today's broadcast industry. Further, the teaching staff of the Telecommunications Department at Central Texas College were not sure their announcing training was meeting the needs of the industry.

The basis for the investigation then, was attributed to the apparent lack of coordination between college training and industry needs. The absence of a standard among colleges in training methods gave credence to the investigation.

The research was undertaken in an effort to discover the desirable competencies of announcers as required by the broadcast industry. Once these competencies were known, the announcing course could include instructional material and training exercises appropriate to the student and industry in which he sought employment.

In order to discover the announcing competencies desired by the broadcast industry, a descriptive survey was conducted of a significant sample of Texas radio and television stations. A questionnaire with nine items for responses was mailed to a representative number of Texas radio and television station operations managers. The random sample was stratified according to market sizes in order to detect any differences that could be attributed to the population density.

The sample instrument was pretested to ascertain the content validity of the questionnaire. Four members of the Central Texas College Telecommunications Advisory Committee (all broadcast operations managers) reviewed the questionnaire for completeness and validity.

Based on an interpretation of the data received from the survey, certain recommendations for restructuring the announcing classes at Central Texas College occurred.

Background and Significance

Evidence indicated that the popularity of college programs in radio and television had skyrocketed in the last decade. Colleges and universities were graduating more students with communications degrees than the industry could absorb. The concern of educators and broadcast station managers was whether those programs were responding to a phase in broadcasting's popularity, or to the realistic needs of the industry (Feedback, November, 1976).

In the last decade a shift from an academic to a vocational emphasis in broadcast instruction had been one attempt to help produce students who could fulfill the employment needs of the broadcast profession. Even so, keeping current with the technological innovations

and changes in industrial emphases had become increasingly difficult. For example, at the time of the study, industry requirements for well-trained announcers had not been satisfied (Central Texas College Telecommunications Advisory Committee, 1976, Appendix A).

The problem of preparing broadcast announcers with the competencies requried by the industry was of enough significance to warrant a research study which could affect the Telecommunications curriculum at Central Texas College. Recent dapartmental surveys indicated that 48.6 percent of the Central Texas College Telecommunications majors aspired to become announcers (Central Texas College Survey, 1976, Appendix B). This high interest in announcing merited curricular attention and was not groundless.

The demand for radio and television announcers increased as evidenced by 8,265 radio stations and 1,030 television stations licensed in the United States as of May, 1976. This represented a 30 percent growth in radio stations and a 31 percent growth in television stations over the last decade (Broadcasting Yearbook, 1976). There was also evidence to support that the broadcast industry was relying on more announcers than in the past due to a greater emphasis on news and information programming, (Smythe, 1976).

With the knowledge that a significant number of Central Texas College Telecommunications majors aspired to become announcers and the indications that the demand for announcers in the industry was growing, it seemed entirely appropriate to conduct this research study. In conjunction with the basic educational concept of relevant training and curriculum construction, the results of this descriptive study were to be interpreted and reflected in the announcing course at Central Texas

College. By discovering the announcing competencies required by the industry, the appropriate subject matter and training exercises commensurate with those industry requirements were to be incorporated into the curriculum.

Procedures

In order to identify the announcing competencies sought by the broadcast industry, a random descriptive survey was conducted with a representative sample of Texas radio and television station operations managers. Both radio and television stations were surveyed because the Telecommunications Department was designed to produce announcers for both types of broadcast stations.

The 1976 Broadcasting Yearbook was used as a source to randomly pick stations to be surveyed. The addresses and names of operations managers were taken from the same yearbook. The random sample was qualified to the extent that the sample of stations was stratified according to the market size of stations since the market size could contribute to significant differences in responses. The stratification according to market size was not in the research proposal, but was later considered of enough importance to warrant its inclusion.

The questionnaire was pretested for content validity and completeness as it related to the broadcast industry prior to the surveying of the radio and television stations. Four members of the Central Texas Telecommunications Advisory Committee (all broadcast station operations managers) reviewed the questionnaire and returned it with remarks (Appendix C). After an evaluation of the surveying instrument pretest the questionnaires were mailed with return, self-addressed envelopes.

The sample population was 65 television stations and 488 radio stations. Ten television stations were surveyed and 49 radio stations were surveyed. A questionnaire with nine response items was mailed to the randomly chosen broadcast stations (Appendix D). Each response item was to be rated as very important, important, or of little importance. The nine items, (competencies), were listed in no particular order and covered: Audio console operation, vocal quality, reading skills, copy interpretaion skills, writing ability, Third Class Radio-TV Operator's license, interviewing ability, knowledge of equipment, on-air experience, and others.

Upon return of the surveys, the responses were reduced to percentages and interpreted. Each response item was analyzed for conclusiveness of importance and compared between the responses of radio stations and the responses of television stations. When the responses to any item were controversial in terms of significance, a further analysis in terms of market size was undertaken. Basically each response item was measured for a variance in value or relative importance, between the type of station and the market size. Since this was a descriptive study in terms of discovery only, it was not necessary to execute complex statistical relevancies.

It was the writer's hypothesis that the resulting investigation would indicate that more training emphases would be needed in reading techniques, on-air experiences, and in the familiarization of new broadcast equipment used by announcers.

It was noted from the beginning that the reliability of the

surveying instrument could be questioned, but it was assumed that the surveyed population would respond honestly as such a study could ultimately benefit their station and the whole industry.

Results

The returned questionnaires used in the research represented 13.8 percent of all Texas television staions and 5.1 percent of all Texas radio stations. Fifty-five percent of the television responses were from major markets, the largest 100 markets by population in the nation, and forty-five percent represented medium markets, the second 100 largest markets by population in the nation. There were very few television stations in smaller markets due to a lack of economic support in local advertising. Forty-eight percent of the radio responses were from a combination of major and medium markets and fifty-two percent represented small markets. Small markets were designated as those below the largest 200 markets in populations.

The collected questionnaires represented a niney percent return from the television station sample, (N-9) and a fifty-one percent return from the radio station sample, (N-25).

A percentage determination of the responses to each question, when compared by type of broadcast station, indicated some similarities and differences in competencies desired by those operations managers surveyed (Table I - Appendix E).

From the data in Table I it was noted that response items, (2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9) were given similar value ratings by both radio and television stations and response items (1, 6, 7) showed a significant value variance between radio stations and television stations.

There were a few response items from both radio stations and television stations that were controversial and inconclusive in nature. An analysis via market sizes on those inconclusive items made the responses more easily interpretable (Tables II, III - Appendixes F, G).

From the data in Tables II and III it was noted that the variance between market sizes gave explanation to some inconclusive items and demonstrated some tendencies unique to each market.

Discussion, Implications, Recommendations

The proposed study was designed to ascertain the desirable competencies for broadcast announcers. The broadcast industry was sampled for this purpose. Upon preliminary investigation of the data received, it was discovered that there was a variance of the desired announcing competencies between radio station and television station responses. Since the announcing courses at Central Texas College included the preparation of announcers in both types of broadcast stations, it was relevant in a pedagogical sense to look at any such variance in the competencies desired (Table I - Appendix E).

The variance in desired competencies between radio stations and television stations did not suggest that any one competency should receive more emphasis in an announcing course, but rather, that each type of broadcast station has a set of unique announcing needs or skills (Table I - Appendix E). For instance, competency item numbers one, "audio console operation," and six, "3rd Class Radio-TV Operations License," on the questionnaire were highly valued by radio station respondents, but given a low value rating by television station respondents. Concurrently, competency item number seven, "interviewing ability," was

deemed highly important by the television respondents, but given a low value rating by radio station respondents.

The implications resulting from the competency variances between the two types of broadcast stations were not necessarily anticipated, but were easily interpreted. There were recognizable product differences between radio stations and television stations which could explain these competency variances.

At the time of this study, all but a few radio stations in the nation utilized their announcers as audio console operators. Most radio stations did not have a strong enough financial base to support both an audio console operator and an announcer for the same period of station operation. Additionally, all broadcast stations in the United States required certain broadcast transmitter output readings to be recorded every three hours. Federal Communications Regulations required only a FCC Third Class Operator's License with a broadcast endorsement for authority to take transmitter readings (Zeiss, Smith, 1976). Again, it would be financially impractical for radio stations to employ two people during all hours of operation. Therefore, it was understandable that radio station operations managers would desire announcers who had knowledge of audio console operation and who had a FCC Third Class Radio-Telephone Operator's License. Television station operations managers saw "audio console operation" and the "FCC Third Class Operator's License" as being considerably less important.

The television station operation managers indicated a unique desire for the "interviewing ability" competency. Radio station operation managers saw the announcer's abilities at interviewing to be considerably less important. These differences between television

stations and radio stations were explained through an examination of the broadcast stations products. The majority of the radio stations in the nation have a music format as their on-air service where the majority of the television stations in the nation offer a combined video-audio entertainment/information format. Radio stations used announcers primarily for musical programs and commercial productions. Television stations used announcers primarily for news and commercial productions. The difference in services explained the television operations managers' interest in "interviewing abilities" for announcers.

Additionally, television stations would not be particularly interested in having their announcers hold a "FCC Third Class Operator's License." Again, the skill requirements for announcers differed between radio stations and television stations. The majority of television stations in the nation were required by federal law to have a FCC first-class operator on duty at all times (FCC R & R 73.265, 73.661). The first class operator would take all transmitter readings eliminating the need for a Third-Class License to be held by announcers. Also, a television station, being more sophisticated in facilities than a radio station, required a technician for operation of the audio and video consoles. Further, it would have been unlikely for a television station to have an announcer on duty except for news and commercial production periods. The inherent differences between the two broadcast mediums explained why each medium preferred some competencies unique to that type of broadcast station.

The survey results indicated some similarities between radio stations and television stations in desired announcing competencies.

Competency items number 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 all received similar valuations by the broadcast stations. "Reading skills," "copy interpretations skills," and "writing ability" all appeared to be highly desired competencies in the industry. Of the competencies agreed upon in importance by all broadcast stations, "reading skills" was given the highest value in importance. Ninety-two percent of all radio respondents saw "reading skills" as very important for announcers and one-hundred percent of all television respondents indicated these skills were very important. It was understandable that such skills would be important for all announcers since very little announcing is ad-lib.

"Reading skills" was followed in relative value by "copy interpretation skills," "writing ability," and "vocal quality." The emphasis in "copy interpretation skills" by the respondents indicated a strong requirement for broadcast announcers to have the ability to accurately interpret news and commercial copy. Sixty-eight percent of the radio respondents deemed this competency to be very important and seventy-eight percent of the television respondents saw it as a very important competency. Perhaps those valuations could be easily understood since incorrect copy interpretation by an announcer was something that could affect the income of any station. For example, a misplaced aural emphasis in the airing of a commercial could cause a loss of station revenue. Similarly, a newscaster without the ability to correctly interpret news value in news copy could cause a loss in audience size.

"Writing abilities" was the next competency in rank order to be highly valued by the survey respondents. Sixty percent of the radio respondents indicated this competency was very important while seventy-eight percent of the television respondents saw it as being a very impor-

tant competency. Only sixteen percent of the radio respondents saw the writing competency as being of little importance and eleven percent of the television respondents indicated this competency was of little importance. From these responses it was interpreted that "reading skills," "copy interpretation skills," and "writing abilities" were seen as a basic competency requirement for all announcers. Even those competencies which were seen as uniquely important to the respective broadcast mediums did not overshadow, in relative value, basic competencies agreed upon by both types of broadcast stations in Texas.

Surprisingly the "vocal quality" competency was seen as slightly less in importance by radio operations managers than by television operations managers. Ninety-six percent of the radio respondents saw vocal quality as an important to a very important competency. One hundred percent of the television responses indicated vocal quality was an important to a very important competency.

The competency items remaining to be discussed, "knowledge of equipment" and "on-air expreience" were similar in responses between radio stations and television stations. The range of responses, in terms of value, however, were seen as inconclusive. A further investigation by market sizes indicated some more conclusive divisions (Table II, III - Appendixes F, G).

The television sample return was divided between major market stations, the largest 100 markets by population in the nation, and medium market stations, the second 100 largest markets by population in the nation. There are very few television stations located in small markets, those below the 200 largest markets in population, and none of the television respondents in the survey represented a small market.

Fifty-five percent of the television sample return represented major markets and forty-five percent of the return represented medium markets.

From the market breakdown, (Table II - Appendix F), it was interpreted to be more important for announcers in major markets to have a knowledge of equipment than for announcers in medium markets to have equipment knowledge. The evidence still indicated that equipment knowledge was important for all television announcers.

"On-air experience" was seen as very important by fifty percent of the medium market television stations, but only twenty percent of the major market television stations indicated it was very important. The evidence still indicated that previous experience was important for all television announcers.

The radio sample return was divided between major/medium market stations and small market stations. Forty-eight percent of the radio sample return represented major/medium markets and fifty-two percent of the radio sample return represented small markets.

The market breakdown, (Table III - Appendix G) represented those competency items which could be seen as controversial or inconclusive. Survey questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were broken down by market sizes.

Since the data in Table I indicated a polarization among respondents on the question of Third Class Operator's License, item number six, it was felt a market-size breakdown would be useful. The results of the market-size analysis indicated a large majority, ninety-two percent, of the small market radio stations saw the "FCC Third Class License" as important for announcers. The major/medium market stations were split almost evely in terms of importance for an announcer to have a FCC Third Class License. This was probably due to the fact that some very large

stations had technicians on duty during all hours of broadcasting.

The responses to question number seven, "interviewing ability," by radio station respondents also seemed inconclusive. A market-size breakdown of that question indicated that larger market-size stations saw an announcer's ability at interviewing slightly more important than did the small market respondents. This was understandable since larger market-size radio stations generally have a stronger emphasis in news than do stations from small markets. All sized stations, however, seemed to agree that interviewing ability was at least important for radio announcers.

The question of "on-air experience," item number nine, was more conclusive with the market-size breakdown. The results were obvious that major/medium market stations saw on-air experience as being more important than did the respondents of small market stations. The difference was attributed to the fact that most small stations, having less financial income than larger market stations, had to depend upon lesser experienced and lesser paid announcers.

There were responses to the "other qualities desired" optional survey question. The bulk of those responses centered on an announcer's ability to work with others and an enthusiasim for the broadcast business.

The purpose of this research study was to discover the current announcing competencies desired by the broadcast industry in order to provide Central Texas College Telecommunications students with announcing training relevant to today's industry. It was expected in the practicum proposal that the completed investigation and implementation of the consequent recommendations would result in: (1) a service to the broadcast industry, (2) more qualified Central Texas College Telecommunications

graduates, and (3) a strengthened and more relevant Telecommunications curriculum at Central Texas College.

Based on the results of the investigation it was recommended that the broadcast announcing course at Central Texas College: (1) recognize the inherent differences between television announcing requirements and radio announcing requirements, (2) change the present course syllabus to include subject matter emphases in the announcing competencies deemed important by the research data, and (3) provide for training exercises appropriate to the needs of the broadcast industry as reflected in the research data.

Implementation of the recommendations was based on the ability of the writer, as chairman of the Telecommunications Department, to affect the appropriate curricular changes. In order to recognize the inherent announcing differences between radio stations and television stations and to insure that each of those differences would be understood, certain course changes were implemented.

An analysis of the research data suggested that radio stations looked for announcers trained as disc jockeys with commercial production skills. Television stations looked for announcers trained for news and commercial production skills. It was requested by the Central Texas College Telecommunications Department chairman that the announcing course include an instructional unit on broadcast equipment, a unit of FCC regulations, and a unit on broadcast journalism.

To insure that each of the announcing competencies shown preference by the sampled broadcast stations was covered in the Central Texas College announcing classes, the course syllabus was altered appropriately. Further it was requested by the Telecommunications Department chairman that labora-

tory training would include exercises to cover the preferred competencies. A thorough review of the study results was given to the entire Telecommunications faculty.

It was believed that the implementation of the researcher's recommendations would result in a potential service to the broadcast industry, would result in the potential for more qualified Telecommunications graduates, and did result in a strengthened, more relevant Telecommunications curriculum at Central Texas College.

REFERENCES CITED

Brown, E., Landphair, T. Graduate vs. Employer, Feedback. Broadcast Education Association, 1976. p. 10, 11.

Broadcasting Yearbook. 1976, p. C-301, B-80-83.

Central Texas College Survey. Freshmen Telecommunications Survey, Fall, 1976.

Central Texas College Telecommunications Advisory Committee Minutes. Central Texas College. Fall, 1976.

Smythe, Ted C. Issues in Broadcasting. Mayfield Publishing Company. 1975, p. 31.

Zeiss, P., Smith, N., Broadcast Announcers License Manual. Hayden Publishing Company. 1976, p.4.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

September 16, 1976

TO: Dean Moffitt, Ben Wickersham, Meeting Participants

FROM: P. Anthony Zeiss

PARTICIPANTS:

Raymond Britton, Operations Mgr. KCEN-TV
Neil Collier, Gen. Mgr. KTON
George Franz, Gen. Mgr. KTEM, KPLE
Ed Jasuta, Mgr. KNCT, Instructor
Chuck Kelly, Operations Mgr. KTON, Instructor
Seth Sparkman, Mgr. KNCT-FM, Instructor
Gene Stephens, Program Mgr. KNCT-FM
Ken Williams, Vice Pres. and Gen. Mgr. KIXS
Tony Zeiss, Dept. Chairman, Asst. to V.P. for Comm. & Dev.

The agenda included a state of the department report by Mr. Sparkman, a discussion and tour of the broadcasting facilities by Mr. Jasuta, and a lengthy discussion on the curriculum initiated by Mr. Zeiss. Auditions for four positions on KNCT-FM were reviewed.

Basically, enrollment in the department is up nearly 30% and the curriculum was sited as the most significant recruitment device by surveyed freshmen.* Facilities and location followed as the next best reasons for enrollment.

Considerable discussion on present demands of the industry and ramifications of new technologies led to a unanimous endorsement of a revised telecommunications curriculum. It was felt by the advisory committee that all graduates of the program need a basic course in the technical aspects of the industry. We now offer such a course as an elective, but need to make it a requirement. Additionally, the new electronic news gathering technology, ie. mini-cam reporting is being adopted by numerous TV stations in the nation. We need to include this training in the last half of Film II class.**

These recommended curricula changes should be implemented in the Fall, 1977. A formal revision request will soon be prepared for the Texas Education Agency.

* See attached report
** See attached curriculum sheet

Additional discussion centered on the importance of the practium course and every committee member emphasized that practical training in writing, commercial production and sales presentation techniques should be stressed in student training.

One particular point brought out by the advisory committee was the need for well trained announcers. It was unanimously vocalized that the industry requirements for good announcers are not being met. Also, it was felt that most of today's graduates seem ill-prepared as announcers.

The next advisory meeting is slated for Spring, 1977 as a barbeque and Kool-aid bust.

PAZ:lmw

APPENDIX B

FRESHMAN TELECOM 131 - STATISTICAL COMPILATION

Number of Respondents: 37

Average Age: 21.648 years

Hometowns:

1.	Killeen - Copperas Cove - Temple Belton - Harker Heights - Lampasas	11	(29.7%)
2.	Other Texas Areas	13	(35.1%)
3.	Non-Texas Hometowns	9	(24.3%)
4.	No Hometown listed	4	(10.8%)

General Areas of Interest:

Radio	7	(18.9%)
Television	17	(45.9%)
Both Radio & TV	7	(18.9%)
Undecided	6	(16.2%)

Type of Work Desired	Number of Responses	
Audio	3	(8.1%)
Film	5	(13.5%)
Writing	4	(10.8%)
Announcing	18	(48.6%)
Sports	6	(16.2%)
TV Camerawork	8	(21.6%)
Management	2	(5.4%)
TV Directing	4	(10.8%)
News	10	(27.0%)
Sales	4	(10.8%)
Disc Jockey	1	(2.7%)

*Several students responded to more than one category.

How Respondents Learned of Central Texas College:

Source	# Responses	
1. Parents	6	(16.2%)
2. High School Couselors	9	(24.3%)
3. Friends	10	(27.0%)
4. Mailed Literature	1	(2.7%)
5. Career Nights	1	(2.7%)
6. Recruiting Visit by CTC Representative	6	(16.2%)
7. Military Information	1	(2.7%)
8. Resident of Area	4	(10.8%)
9. Personal Research	2	(5.4%)
10. Radio-TV Announcements	2	(5.4%)

*Several students responded to more than one category.

Reasons for Deciding to Attend CTC:

Category	# Responses	
1. Visit to Facilities	16	(43.2%)
2. Promotional Literature	3	(8.1%)
3. Desired Curriculum	20	(54.0%)
4. School Location	14	(37.8%)
5. Financial Considerations	13	(35.1%)

*Several students responded to more than one category.

APPENDIX C

November 2, 1976

Mr. Kenneth Williams
General Manager
KIXS Radio
Killeen, Texas 76541

Dear Mr. Williams:

In an effort to equip prospective announcers with the skills sought by the broadcast industry, a random survey will be conducted of state-wide radio and television station operations managers by the Telecommunications Department of Central Texas College. A questionnaire will be mailed as an instrument to identify their desirable announcing competencies.

This questionnaire needs to be pre-tested for reliability and usefullness in the project. As an advisory committee member to the department, would you review the questionnaire for completeness and validity as it relates to today's broadcast industry? If you feel there are any questions which should be altered, added or deleted please so indicate with the enclosed postage paid envelope. You do not need to complete the survey at this time, but your comments about it will be most helpful.

Thanking you in advance.

Sincerely,

P. Anthony Zeiss
Department Chairman
Telecommunications

PAZ:lmcb

ACCENT RADIO CORPORATION
Post Office Box 880
Communications Cntr
Killeen, Texas 76541
Phone 817-634-3161

Mr. Tony Zeiss
Telecommunications Chairman
Central Texas College
Highway 190 West
Killeen, Texas 76541

Dear Tony:

The survey instrument you proposed looks complete and should be a valuable aid to the department in determining the desired quality for announcers.

Let me know if I can assist further, and will be interested in the results.

Sincerely,

Ken Williams

KEN WILLIAMS
PRESIDENT
ACCENT RADIO CORPORATION

KW/dw

KIXS

KTON 94
FM STEREO - 106.3

BELTON BROADCASTERS, INC.
President
TOM E. TURNER
General Manager
NEIL COLLIER

Serving the Growing Killeen - Temple Metro Area

Main Studio: P. O. Box 240, Belton, Texas 76513 817 - 939-3738 / 634-0940 Killeen: 312 W. Rancier, 817 - 526-4007

November 16, 1976

Mr. P. Anthony Zeiss
Central Texas College
Highway 190 West
Killeen, Texas

Dear Tony,

Just a short note regarding your recent survey concerning curriculum and course needs in the Telecommunications Department. Neil Collier, our General Manager, and I were discussing this and both agree that your approach is to be commended. Too many Radio-TV graduates turn up seeking that first professional position completely at a loss when asked to perform certain skills. The CTC approach should eliminate this and encourage prospective employers to look forward to interviewing your former students.

The various areas that you question broadcasters about in your survey clearly shows your intentions to completely "equip" your students. I feel that all areas have been covered and am encouraged by the thoroughness of your study. Please place my name on the list of prospective employers to contact.

Best Personal Regards,

Chuck Kelly

Chuck Kelly
Operations Manager
KTON AM/FM

KCEN TV 6
NBC
TEMPLE WACO

STUDIOS AND TRANSMITTER • PHONE WACO 817 859-5481
MAIN OFFICE
STUDIOS & TRANSMITTER
IH-35
• EDDY, TEXAS

BUSINESS OFFICE
BOX 188, 17 S. 3RD ST.
TEMPLE, TEXAS 76501
• 817 773-1633

PHONE TEMPLE 817 773-6868 • TWX 910 890-4870
WACO SALES OFFICE
811 CITIZENS TOWER
WACO, TEXAS 76701
• 817 756-0332

RECEIVED
NOV 19 1976
DIRECTOR OF
BROADCAST SERVICES

November 18, 1976

Mr. P. Anthony Zeiss
Department Chairman
Telecommunications
Central Texas College
Highway 190 West
Killeen, Texas 76541

Dear Tony,

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you on the survey form. I've been out of town for a few days. I've discussed this with members of our News Department and Production Department. Everything looks good that was on the form, except there were two suggestions that should be added. One category on knowledge of photography, and one person suggested a category on the ability to follow directions.

Outside of this, the form looks very good to me.

Please feel free to call on me anytime.

Sincerely,

Raymond Britton
Operations Manager

RB/tg

ktem14

POST OFFICE BOX 1230 / TEMPLE, TEXAS 76501 / TELEPHONE (817) 773-5252

November 4, 1976

Mr. Tony Zeiss
Central Texas College
Highway 190 West
Bell-Coryell Counties
Killeen, Texas 76541

Dear Tony,

The questions all look good. Number 9 in our estimation is the most important question on the survey. Perhaps an added question should be knowledge of FCC rules and regulations. If you had room to add another question, perhaps it should center around the persons ability to work with others and his moral stability...and ability to adapt to changes.

I would like a copy of your survey results when you get them all tabulated.

Your friend,

George A. Franz
KTEM/KPLE Radio
Temple, Texas

RECEIVED
NOV 8 1976
DIRECTOR OF
BROADCAST SERVICES

A FORMBY STATION AFFILIATED WITH

kple TEMPLE, TEXAS
ktbb TYLER, TEXAS
kpan HEREFORD, TEXAS
klvt LEVELLAND, TEXAS

APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In an effort to provide the broadcast industry with well trained announcers, the telecommunications department at Central Texas College would like your assistance. We are attempting to discover the qualities in broadcast announcers you deem important to your operation.

Would you please give us your thoughts by completing the brief survey and using the return postage-paid envelope for mailing. Thank you.

1. Audio console operation skills

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

2. Vocal quality

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

3. Reading skills

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

4. Copy interpretation skill

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

5. Writing abilities (commercials and news)

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

6. 3rd Class Radio - TV operators license

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

7. Interviewing Ability

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

8. Knowledge of equipment (Tape recorders, film cameras, microphones)

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

9. On-air experience

_____Very Important _____Important _____Little Importance

10. Other qualities desired:_____

_____

Name:_____Title:_____

Address:_____Call Letters:_____

City:_____State_____Zip:_____Radio_____ TV_____

Please return to the Telecommunications Dept., Central Texas College in the envelope provided. Thank you.

APPENDIX E

TABLE I

STATISTICAL RESULTS

SAMPLE POPULATION		SAMPLE RETURNS
Total Texas Radio Stations	488	51% Return Representing 5.1% of all Texas Radio Stations, (N-25)
Total Texas TV Stations	65	90% Return Representing 13.8% of all Texas TV Stations, (N-9)

COMPETENCY	Percent of Radio Sample	Percent of TV Sample
1. Audio Console Operation:		
Very Important	48	11
Important	44	11
Little Importance	8	78
2. Vocal Quality		
Very Important	40	55
Important	56	45
Little Importance	4	0
3. Reading Skills		
Very Important	92	100
Important	8	0
Little Importance	0	0
4. Copy Interpretation Skill		
Very Important	68	78
Important	24	22
Little Importance	8	0
5. Writing Abilities		
Very Important	60	78
Important	24	11
Little Importance	16	11
6. 3rd Class Radio-TV Oper. License		
Very Important	68	11
Important	8	11
Little Importance	24	78
7. Interviewing Ability		
Very Important	16	78
Important	58	22
Little Importance	28	0

COMPETENCY	Percent of Radio Sample	Percent of TV Sample
8. Knowledge of Equipment (Tape Recorders, film cameras, microphones)		
Very Important	52	45
Important	28	33
Little Importance	20	22
9. On-Air Experience		
Very Important	20	33
Important	60	45
Little Importance	20	22

APPENDIX F

TABLE II

TELEVISION SAMPLE-MARKET SIZE VARIANCE

BETWEEN CONTROVERSIAL ITEMS #8, 9

55% of Return - Major Market
45% of Return - Medium Market

Questions eight and nine on the survey appeared to have no clear-cut agreement among the television sample on degrees of importance. A breakdown by market size was:

	% of Major TV Market Sample	% of Medium TV Market Sample
8. Knowledge of equipment		
Very Important	60	25
Important	20	50
Little Importance	20	25
9. On-Air Experience		
Very Important	20	50
Important	60	25
Little Importance	20	25

APPENDIX G

TABLE III

RADIO SAMPLE-MARKET SIZE VARIANCE

BETWEEN CONTROVERSIAL ITEMS #6, 7, 8, 9

48% of Return - Major and Medium Market
52% of Return - Small Market

Questions six, seven, eight, and nine on the survey appeared to have no clear-cut agreement among the radio sample on degrees of importance. A breakdown by market size was:

	% of Major/Medium Radio Markets Sample	% of Small Radio Market Sample
6. 3rd Class Radio-TV Oper. License		
Very Important	50	85
Important	8	7
Little Importance	42	7
7. Interviewing Ability		
Very Important	25	7
Important	50	61
Little Importance	25	31
8. Knowledge of Equipment		
Very Important	50	54
Important	42	15
Little Importance	8	31
9. On-Air Experience		
Very Important	33	7
Important	67	54
Little Importance	0	38